

CAZON  
TO1  
-1990  
L22

Sports and Fitness

Sports et  
condition physique

Government of Ontario  
Publications

## RESEARCH REPORT

## RECHERCHES EN LOISIRS

### LEISURE BEHAVIOUR AND RECREATION NEEDS OF ONTARIO'S ETHNOCULTURAL POPULATIONS

#### Executive Summary

Michael H. Hall, Darla Rhyne  
Institute for Social Research  
York University  
December 1988



Ontario Ministry of Tourism and Recreation  
Ministère du Tourisme et des Loisirs de l'Ontario



CA20N  
TO1  
-1988  
L22

LEISURE BEHAVIOUR AND  
RECREATION NEEDS OF ONTARIO'S  
ETHNOCULTURAL POPULATIONS

Executive Summary

Michael H. Hall, Darla Rhyne  
Institute for Social Research  
York University  
December 1988

Published by the  
Ministry of Tourism and Recreation  
Printed by the Queen's Printer  
for Ontario  
Province of Ontario  
Toronto, Canada

© 1989 Government of Ontario  
This publication is available in French

ISBN 0-7729-5928-5






## STAFF AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Many people assisted with this study and their contributions are gratefully acknowledged. We would first like to thank the people who participated in the survey throughout the Province.

Betsy Heatly, who served as Project Manager for the Ministry of Tourism and Recreation, assisted with many aspects of the study. An advisory committee assisted in the research design and report phases of the study. The committee members were: Halina Kantor, Parks and Recreation Department, City of North York, David McCrindle, Ministry of Tourism and Recreation, and Hans du Vaal, Parks and Recreation Department, City of Toronto.

At our Institute, many people worked to complete this study. David Bates assisted in overall research, sample and questionnaire design. David Northrup assisted with questionnaire design and project management here at the Institute. Bill Bruce assisted with questionnaire design and implementation on our CATI (computer assisted telephone interviewing) system as well as with data processing. John Tibert also provided CATI assistance. Tammy Chi, Peter McVey and John Pollard supervised field work and assisted with questionnaire design. Winsome Cain also supervised field work. Pierre Angers assisted with the coding of open-ended responses. Anne Oram and Alena Pesek provided data processing assistance and Valerie Preston offered editorial assistance. Anita Citron produced this document.

Professors Hymie I. Day and Joseph Levy of York University served as consultants in the research design and report stages of the study.



Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2022 with funding from  
University of Toronto

<https://archive.org/details/31761115464281>

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction and Background . . . . .	1
Executive Summary . . . . .	3
Literature Review . . . . .	3
The Survey of Ontario's Ethnocultural Population . . . . .	4
Sociodemographic Backgrounds . . . . .	7
Leisure Participation. . . . .	8
Favourite Leisure Activities . . . . .	9
Favourite Activities - The Context of Participation . . . . .	9
Barriers to Participation. . . . .	10
Leisure Ethic. . . . .	11
Leisure Motivations . . . . .	12
Satisfaction with Areas of Life Related to Leisure . . . . .	12
The Need for Ethnocultural Specific Leisure Opportunities. . . . .	13
The Survey of Ministry of Tourism and Recreation Client Groups. . . . .	14
Characteristics of Organizations Surveyed . . . . .	14
Ethnocultural Diversity of Client Base . . . . .	14
Current Practices Regarding Ethnocultural Clients . . . . .	15
Importance of Providing Services to Members of Ethnocultural Groups . . . . .	16
Language of Services . . . . .	16
Design and Delivery of Recreation Programs/Services . . . . .	16
Assistance for Recreation Organizations. . . . .	17
Discussion. . . . .	18
Conclusion. . . . .	22
Ethnocultural Identity and Leisure: Literature Review . . . . .	24
Limitations of Existing Research . . . . .	24
Differences in Participation Patterns . . . . .	27
Leisure Preferences and Needs . . . . .	29
Attitudes Toward Leisure . . . . .	31
Social Group Context . . . . .	32
Differences in Constraints and Barriers . . . . .	33
Conclusion . . . . .	34

# TABLES OF CONTENTS (cont'd)

The Survey of Ontario's Ethnocultural Populations . . . . .	35
Research Design . . . . .	35
Definition of Leisure . . . . .	35
Sample Design . . . . .	37
Sample . . . . .	37
Response Rates . . . . .	39
Questionnaire Design . . . . .	39
Language of Interviews . . . . .	40
Analysis Strategy . . . . .	40
Interpretation of Tables . . . . .	45
Ethnocultural Group Sociodemographic Characteristics. . . . .	46
Leisure Participation . . . . .	62
Limited Variety - Low Activity . . . . .	66
Limited Variety - Mixed Activity . . . . .	67
Wide Variety - High Activity . . . . .	68
Wide Variety - Low Activity. . . . .	69
Wide Variety - Mixed Activity. . . . .	69
Mixed Patterns . . . . .	70
Favourite Leisure Activities . . . . .	107
Differences in Favourite Activities . . . . .	107
Differences in Second Favourite Activities . . . . .	108
Favourite Activities - The Context of Participation. . . . .	115
Barriers to Participation . . . . .	122
Leisure Ethic. . . . .	136
Leisure Motivation . . . . .	141
Differences in Motivation . . . . .	143
Satisfaction with Areas of Life Related to Leisure . . . . .	163
The Less Satisfied Groups. . . . .	165
The More Satisfied Groups. . . . .	166
Mixed Profiles. . . . .	167
The Need for Ethnocultural Specific Leisure Opportunities . . . . .	185
Groups who Place More Importance on Availability . . . . .	187



# TABLE OF CONTENTS (cont'd)

The Survey of Ministry of Tourism and Recreation Client Groups . . .	204
Research Design . . . . .	204
Response Rate . . . . .	206
Questionnaire Design . . . . .	206
Analysis Strategy . . . . .	206
Results . . . . .	207
Characteristics of Organizations Surveyed . . . . .	207
Ethnocultural Diversity of Client Base . . . . .	208
Current Practices Regarding Ethnocultural Clients . . . . .	210
Importance of Providing Services to Members . . . . .	210
of Ethnocultural Groups . . . . .	210
Language of Services . . . . .	211
Design and Delivery of Recreation Programs/Services . . . . .	212
Designing Programs . . . . .	212
Staffing Programs . . . . .	213
Management/Administration . . . . .	214
Assistance for Recreation Organizations . . . . .	215
Providers of Current Assistance . . . . .	215
Perceived Need for Assistance . . . . .	216
Discussion . . . . .	247
Survey of Ethnical Population . . . . .	247
Future Research . . . . .	254
Survey of Recreation Service Providers . . . . .	256
Future Research . . . . .	257
Conclusion . . . . .	258



# LIST OF TABLES

	Page
1 The self-identified ethnicity of respondents . . . . .	38
2 Results of Telephone Interviews. . . . .	41
3 Ethnocultural group categories used for analysis by the self-identified ethnicity of respondents. . . . .	42
4 Gender by Ethnocultural Group. . . . .	52
5 Age by Ethnocultural Group . . . . .	52
6 Education by Ethnocultural Group . . . . .	53
7 Religion by Ethnocultural Group. . . . .	54
8 Number of years lived in Canada by Ethnocultural Group . . .	55
9 Place of birth by Ethnocultural Group. . . . .	55
10 Language first spoken and still understood by Ethnocultural Group . . . . .	56
11 Language spoken most at home by Ethnocultural Group. . . . .	56
12 Total household income by Ethnocultural Group. . . . .	57
13 Employment status by Ethnocultural Group . . . . .	58
14 Spouse/Partner employment status by Ethnocultural Group . . . . .	58
15 Shift-work by Ethnocultural Group. . . . .	59
16 Marital status by Ethnocultural Group. . . . .	59
17 Number of children by Ethnocultural Group. . . . .	60
18 Residential community by Ethnocultural Group . . . . .	61
19 Provincial region of residence by Ethnocultural Group. . . .	61
20 Favourite activity by Ethnocultural Group. . . . .	63
21 Favourite Activities . . . . .	110
22 Favourite activity by Ethnocultural Group. . . . .	111
23 Second favourite activity by Ethnocultural Group . . . . .	113

# LIST OF TABLES (con't)

24	Social context of favourite activity . . . . .	119
25	Social context of second favourite activity. . . . .	119
26	Ethnocultural background of partners: Favourite activity . .	120
27	Ethnocultural background of partners: Second favourite activity . . . . .	120
28	Prefer doing favourite activity: Same ethnocultural background . . . . .	121
29	Prefer doing 2nd favourite activity: Same ethnocultural background . . . . .	121
30	How strongly do you want to do your 2nd favourite activity? . . . . .	121
31	What keeps you from doing your favourite activity more often? . . . . .	128
32	What keeps you from doing your 2nd favourite activity more often? . . . . .	129
33	Would you do your favourite activity more if you had more opportunities to do it with your own group? . . . . .	130
34	Would you do your 2nd favourite activity more if you had more opportunities to do it with your own group? . . . .	130
35	First choice for a new activity by ethnocultural group . . . . .	131
36	Second choice for a new activity by Ethnocultural Group. . . . .	133
37	How strongly want to do the 2nd thing never done before? . .	135
38	Mean ratings of agreement with Leisure Attitude Scale items . . . . .	138
39	Motivations for participation in favourite activities. . . .	142
40	Satisfaction with areas of life related to leisure . . . . .	164
41	Importance attached to increasing the availability of Ethnocultural specific leisure opportunities. . . . .	186
42	Breakdown of survey sample by client group . . . . .	205



# LIST OF TABLES (cont'd)

43	Number of clients provided with direct service . . . . .	218
44	Ethnocultural diversity of client base. . . . .	218
45	Main Ethnocultural Backgrounds of Clients . . . . .	219
46	Help others to provide recreation services? . . . . .	221
47	Number of groups assisted . . . . .	221
48	Help ethnocultural organizations to provide services? . . . .	222
49	Groups assisted: ethnocultural backgrounds . . . . .	223
50	Dealings with ethnocultural associations. . . . .	225
51	Awareness: programs for particular groups . . . . .	226
52	Specific ethnocultural programs/services . . . . .	226
53	Requests for changes in policies. . . . .	227
54	Responsiveness to requests for policy changes . . . . .	227
55	Planned changes to existing services. . . . .	228
56	Plans to offer new ethnocultural services . . . . .	228
57	Importance of providing services to ethnocultural groups. . .	229
58	Change in effort regarding ethnocultural groups . . . . .	229
59	Assist groups to provide programs in own language? . . . .	230
60	Language in which activities conducted . . . . .	231
61	Language of promotional materials . . . . .	231
62	Need for information about client backgrounds . . . . .	232
63	Consideration of ethnocultural diversity: designing programs . . . . .	233
64	Attempts to determine ethnocultural diversity? . . . . .	233
65	Importance of training staff: ethnocultural issues . . . .	234

# LIST OF TABLES (cont'd)

66	Have staff been trained: ethnocultural issues. . . . .	234
67	Importance: staff have same ethnocultural background . . . .	235
68	Attempt to staff with those of similar backgrounds . . . . .	235
69	Similar backgrounds: full-time staff and clients . . . . .	236
70	Ethnoculturally similar: managers and clients . . . . .	236
71	Receive direction from community board? . . . . .	237
72	Similarity between board members and clients . . . . .	237
73	Importance of ethnocultural membership on boards . . . . .	238
74	Organizations providing assistance - 1st . . . . .	239
75	Organizations providing assistance - 2nd . . . . .	240
76	Type of assistance receive from MTR - 1st . . . . .	241
77	Type of assistance receive from MTR - 2nd . . . . .	241
78	Can Ministry assist in design of programs . . . . .	242
79	Design assistance wish to receive - 1st mention. . . . .	242
80	Design assistance wish to receive - 2nd mention. . . . .	243
81	Can Ministry assist with staff . . . . .	243
82	Staff assistance wish to receive - 1st mention . . . . .	244
83	Staff assistance wish to receive - 2nd mention . . . . .	244
84	Can Ministry assist with program delivery? . . . . .	245
85	Program delivery assistance wish to receive - 1. . . . .	245
86	Program delivery assistance wish to receive - 2. . . . .	246

## LIST OF FIGURES

1	Differences in percentage of participants per activity: British versus non-British .....	73
2	Differences in participants' activity rates: British versus non-British .....	74
3	Differences in percentage of participants per activity: Canadian versus non-Canadian.....	75
4	Differences in participants' activity rates: Canadian versus non-Canadian.....	76
5	Differences in percentage of participants per activity: Chinese versus non-Chinese .....	77
6	Differences in participants' activity rates: Chinese versus non-Chinese.....	78
7	Differences in percentage of participants per activity: Dutch versus non-Dutch.....	79
8	Differences in participants' activity rates: Dutch versus non-Dutch.....	80
9	Differences in percentage of participants per activity: French versus non-French.....	81
10	Differences in participants' activity rates: French versus non-French.....	82
11	Differences in percentage of participants per activity: German versus non-German .....	83
12	Differences in participants' activity rates: German versus non-German .....	84
13	Differences in percentage of participants per activity: Italian versus non-Italian .....	85
14	Differences in participants' activity rates: Italian versus non-Italian .....	86
15	Differences in percentage of participants per activity: Jewish versus non-Jewish .....	87
16	Differences in participants' activity rates: Jewish versus non-Jewish .....	88

# LIST OF FIGURES (cont'd)

17	Differences in percentage of participants per activity: Other versus non-Other .....	89
18	Differences in participants' activity rates: Other versus non-Other.....	90
19	Differences in percentage of participants per activity: Polish versus non-Polish.....	91
20	Differences in participants' activity rates: Polish versus non-Polish .....	92
21	Differences in percentage of participants per activity: Portuguese versus non-Portuguese.....	93
22	Differences in participants' activity rates: Portuguese versus non-Portuguese.....	94
23	Differences in percentage of participants per activity: S.C. European versus non-S. C. European.....	95
24	Differences in participants' activity rates: S. C. European versus non-S. C. European.....	96
25	Differences in percentage of participants per activity: S.E. European versus non-S.E. European.....	97
26	Differences in participants' activity rates: S.E. European versus non-S.E. European.....	98
27	Differences in percentage of participants per activity: Scandinavian versus non-Scandinavian.....	99
28	Differences in participants' activity rates: Scandinavian versus non-Scandinavian.....	100
29	Differences in percentage of participants per activity: South Asian versus non-South Asian.....	101
30	Differences in participants' activity rates: South Asian versus non-South Asian.....	102
31	Differences in percentage of participants per activity: Ukrainian versus non-Ukrainian.....	103
32	Differences in participants' activity rates: Ukrainian versus non-Ukrainian.....	104
33	Differences in percentage of participants per activity: West Indian versus non-West Indian.....	105



# LIST OF FIGURES (con't)

34	Differences in participants' activity rates: West Indian versus non-West Indian.....	106
35	Differences in mean ratings on leisure quantity scale: ethnocultural groups versus all others .....	139
36	Differences in mean scores on leisure value scale: ethnocultural groups versus all others.....	140
37	Differences in mean ratings on motivation scales: British versus non-British .....	146
38	Differences in mean ratings on motivation scales: Canadian versus non-Canadians .....	147
39	Differences in mean ratings on motivation scales: Chinese versus non-Chinese.....	148
40	Differences in mean ratings on motivation scales: Dutch versus non-Dutch.....	149
41	Differences in mean ratings on motivation scales: French versus non-French.....	150
42	Differences in mean ratings on motivation scales: German versus non-Germans.....	151
43	Differences in mean ratings on motivation scales: Italian versus non-Italians.....	152
44	Differences in mean ratings on motivation scales: Jewish versus non-Jewish.....	153
45	Differences in mean ratings on motivation scales: Other versus non-Other.....	154
46	Differences in mean ratings on motivation scales: Polish versus non-Polish.....	155
47	Differences in mean ratings on motivation scales: Portuguese versus non-Portuguese.....	156
48	Differences in mean ratings on motivation scales: S.C. European versus non-S.C. Europeans.....	157
49	Differences in mean ratings on motivation scales: S.E. European versus non-S.E. Europeans.....	158
50	Differences in mean ratings on motivation scales: Scandinavian versus non-Scandinavians.....	159

# LIST OF FIGURES (cont'd)

51	Differences in mean ratings on motivation scales: South Asian versus non-South Asians.....	160
52	Differences in mean ratings on motivation scales: Ukrainian versus non-Ukrainians.....	161
53	Differences in mean ratings on motivation scales: West Indian versus non-West Indian.....	162
54	Differences in mean ratings on satisfaction scales: British versus non-British .....	168
55	Differences in mean ratings on satisfaction scales: Canadian versus non-Canadians .....	169
56	Differences in mean ratings on satisfaction scales: Chinese versus non-Chinese.....	170
57	Differences in mean ratings on satisfaction scales: Dutch versus non-Dutch.....	171
58	Differences in mean ratings on satisfaction scales: French versus non-French.....	172
59	Differences in mean ratings on satisfaction scales: German versus non-Germans.....	173
60	Differences in mean ratings on satisfaction scales: Italian versus non-Italians.....	174
61	Differences in mean ratings on satisfaction scales: Jewish versus non-Jewish.....	175
62	Differences in mean ratings on satisfaction scales: Other versus non-Other.....	176
63	Differences in mean ratings on satisfaction scales: Polish versus non-Polish.....	177
64	Differences in mean ratings on satisfaction scales: Portuguese versus non-Portuguese.....	178
65	Differences in mean ratings on satisfaction scales: S.C. European versus non-S.C. Europeans.....	179
66	Differences in mean ratings on satisfaction scales: S.E. European versus non-S.E. Europeans.....	180

# LIST OF FIGURES (cont'd)

67	Differences in mean ratings on satisfaction scales: Scandinavian versus non-Scandinavians.....	181
68	Differences in mean ratings on satisfaction scales: South Asian versus non-South Asians.....	182
69	Differences in mean ratings on satisfaction scales: Ukrainian versus non-Ukrainians.....	183
70	Differences in mean ratings on satisfaction scales: West Indian versus non-West Indian.....	184
71	Differences in mean ratings on importance scales: British versus non-British .....	188
72	Differences in mean ratings on importance scales: Chinese versus non-Chinese .....	189
73	Differences in mean ratings on importance scales: Dutch versus non-Dutch .....	190
74	Differences in mean ratings on importance scales: French versus non-French .....	191
75	Differences in mean ratings on importance scales: German versus non-German .....	192
76	Differences in mean ratings on importance scales: Italian versus non-Italian .....	193
77	Differences in mean ratings on importance scales: Jewish versus non-Jewish.....	194
78	Differences in mean ratings on importance scales: Other versus non-Other.....	195
79	Differences in mean ratings on importance scales: Polish versus non-Polish .....	196
80	Differences in mean ratings on importance scales: Portuguese versus non-Portuguese .....	197
81	Differences in mean ratings on importance scales: S.C. European versus non-S.C. European.....	198
82	Differences in mean ratings on importance scales: S.E. European versus non-S.E. European.....	199

LIST OF FIGURES (cont'd)

83	Differences in mean ratings on importance scales: Scandinavian versus non-Scandinavian.....	200
84	Differences in mean ratings on importance scales: South Asian versus non-South Asian.....	201
85	Differences in mean ratings on importance scales: Ukrainian versus non-Ukrainian.....	202
86	Differences in mean ratings on importance scales: West Indian versus non-West Indian.....	203



## INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

This report presents the results of the Ontario Survey of the Recreation Needs of Ethnocultural Populations commissioned by the Sports and Fitness Branch of Ontario Ministry of Recreation and Tourism and conducted by the Institute for Social Research at York University. It was designed to provide information about the extent to which all of Ontario's ethnocultural groups participate in the various components of recreation, their leisure needs and the adequacy of recreation service provided to these groups.

This study had two components. The first component examined whether or not there were differences in the leisure behaviour of Ontario's ethnocultural residents by means of a province-wide telephone survey. The second utilized a mail-out survey of recreation service providers to assess both their current level of service to ethnocultural populations and their need for support to enhance or develop such service. The design of the research was guided by a review of existing literature regarding ethnocultural aspects of leisure and by input from the Ministry's advisory committee.

For the survey of ethnocultural residents telephone interviews were conducted with 1642 Ontario residents. Information was gathered about a variety of aspects of leisure behaviour: participation patterns, barriers to participation, leisure satisfaction, leisure values, leisure motivations, and leisure needs. Measures of leisure satisfaction provided a measure of the adequacy of recreation service provided to these groups. Socio-demographic information including self-identified ethnocultural background, language(s) spoken, education, and income was also obtained.

The leisure service provider survey was conducted by means of a mail-out survey of 214 recreation service providers. Questionnaires were sent to service providers at a number of organizations who are clients of the Ministry's Recreation Division; municipal recreation departments, public service agencies, provincial sports and recreation associations. Ministry of Tourism and Recreation, Recreation Division staff were also surveyed. Information was obtained about the ethnocultural diversity of clients served,

the attention given to the needs of clients of different ethnocultural backgrounds during the planning and delivery of recreation programs, ethnocultural representation at managerial and administrative levels of service organizations, and the assistance required by recreational services to respond to the needs of clients of different ethnocultural backgrounds. The information was analyzed to determine if there were differences among leisure service providers according to the type of recreation organization to which the respondent belongs.

This report presents the results of this research. An Executive Summary is provided first. A review of the literature regarding ethnocultural aspects of leisure follows. Next, the results of each survey are presented. Recommendations are then made for further research and action concerning the recreation needs of Ontario ethnocultural residents.

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Ontario Survey of the Recreation Needs of Ethnocultural Populations was commissioned by the Sports and Fitness Branch of Ontario Ministry of Recreation and Tourism and conducted by the Institute for Social Research at York University. It provides information about the extent to which all of Ontario's ethnocultural groups participate in the various components of recreation, their leisure needs and the adequacy of recreation service provided to these groups.

The first component of this study examined whether or not there were differences in the leisure behaviour of Ontario's ethnocultural residents by means of a province-wide telephone survey. A second component utilized a mail-out survey of recreation service providers to assess their current level of service to ethnocultural populations and their need for support to enhance or develop such service. The surveys were preceded by a literature review.

### Literature Review

An extensive literature on ethnocultural influences on leisure does not exist. Much of the literature concerning ethnocultural variations in leisure is based on American, British, European or Australian studies and they are mostly irrelevant to the Ontario context.

There are a number of limitations of the literature in terms of its ability to provide insight into ethnocultural variations in the leisure of Ontario residents. One limitation concerns definitions of ethnicity. Some studies treat ethnicity too broadly to allow for insights into particular ethnocultural groups. Many American and some British studies, for example, use ethnicity as a proxy or surrogate for "disadvantaged minority group". The way leisure is defined or operationalized in the studies also limits their usefulness. There is a tendency to categorize leisure activity in ways that shed little light on cultural preferences (e.g. group activities vs.

individual activities) and those definitions which are specific and non-ambiguous tend to be non-comparable across studies. For example, some studies examine outdoor recreation in general while others examine water skiing or visiting parks.

Despite the limitations, the literature does point to certain issues salient exclusively to ethnocultural groups. These include: family as the unit of leisure; gender segregation; length of time in the new homeland and identity maintaining aspects of leisure. However, there is little documentation of how these factors work themselves out in Ontario.

### The Survey of Ontario's Ethnocultural Populations

For the survey of ethnocultural residents telephone interviews were conducted with 1642 Ontario residents in five languages (Chinese, French, English, Italian and Portuguese). Information was gathered about a variety of aspects of leisure behaviour: participation patterns, barriers to participation, leisure satisfaction, leisure values, leisure motivations, and leisure needs. Measures of leisure satisfaction provided a measure of the adequacy of recreation service provided to these groups. Sociodemographic information including self-identified ethnocultural background, language(s) spoken, education, and income was also obtained. The response rate was 62.4%.

Table 1 presents the ethnic or cultural backgrounds to which the respondents felt they belonged.

In order to examine ethnocultural variations in leisure in an efficient manner, smaller ethnocultural groups were combined to form ethnocultural analysis groups.

TABLE A Ethnocultural group categories used for analysis by the self-identified ethnicity of respondents

Ethnocultural Group	Self-Identified Ethnicity	Frequency	Percent	Total Group Frequency	Total Percent
BRITISH	- British	39	2.5	131	8.4
	English	50	3.2		
	Irish	23	1.5		
	Scottish	17	1.1		
	Welsh/Celtic	2	0.1		
CANADIAN	- Canadian	462	29.5	462	29.5
CHINESE	- Chinese	39	2.5	39	2.5
DUTCH	- Dutch	68	4.4	68	4.4
FRENCH	- French	139	8.9	139	8.9
GERMAN	- German	104	6.6	104	6.6
ITALIAN	- Italian	103	6.6	103	6.6
JEWISH	- Jewish	40	2.6	40	2.6
POLISH	- Polish	38	2.4	38	2.4
PORTUGUESE	- Portuguese	49	3.1	49	3.1
SOUTH CENTRAL EUROPEAN	- Austrian	3	0.2	38	2.4
	Czechoslovakian	10	0.6		
	Hungarian	24	1.5		
	Slovak	1	0.1		
SOUTH EASTERN EUROPEAN	- Albanian	1	0.1	49	3.1
	Croatian	6	0.4		
	Greek	22	1.4		
	Macedonian	3	0.2		
	Romanian	1	0.1		
	Yugoslavian	16	1.0		
SOUTH ASIAN	- East Indian	11	0.7	29	1.8
	Hindu	2	0.1		
	Indian	7	0.4		
	Pakistani	3	0.2		
	Sri-Lankan	4	0.3		
	Tamil	2	0.1		



TABLE A Ethnocultural group categories used for analysis by the self-identified ethnicity of respondents (cont'd)

Ethnocultural Group	Self-Identified Ethnicity	Frequency	Percent	Total Group Frequency	Total Percent
SCANDINAVIAN	- Danish	8	0.5	32	2.0
	Finnish	9	0.6		
	Norwegian	2	0.1		
	Scandinavian	3	0.2		
	Swedish	8	0.5		
	Icelandic	2	0.1		
UKRAINIAN	- Ukrainian	46	2.9	46	2.9
WEST INDIAN	- Antiguan	1	0.1	49	3.2
	Barbadian	1	0.1		
	Caribbean	27	1.7		
	Jamaican	16	1.0		
	Trinidadian	4	0.3		
OTHER SMALL ETHNO-CULTURAL GROUPS	- African	5	0.3	141	9.3
	American	15	1.0		
	Arabian	2	0.1		
	Armenian	1	0.1		
	Asian	3	0.2		
	Australian/ New Zealand	3	0.2		
	Baltic	1	0.1		
	Black	4	0.3		
	Brazilian	2	0.1		
	Colombian	1	0.1		
	Egyptian	2	0.1		
	Estonian	4	0.3		
	European	3	0.2		
	Flemish	1	0.1		
	Ghanian	1	0.1		
	Guyanese	8	0.5		
	Iranian	2	0.1		
	Japanese	4	0.3		
	Korean	3	0.2		
	Latvian	6	0.4		
	Lebanese	8	0.5		
	Luxembourg	1	0.1		
	Maltese	3	0.2		
	Mennonite	3	0.2		
	Native People	22	1.5		
	Nigerian	1	0.1		
	Philippino	14	0.9		
	Russian	7	0.4		
	Spanish	5	0.3		
	Swiss	3	0.2		
	Tibetan	1	0.1		
	Turkish	1	0.1		
	Vietnamese	1	0.1		

### Sociodemographic Backgrounds.

The groups differ significantly along a number of sociodemographic variables. The most notable differences lie in the extent to which members were born in Canada, first spoke and still understand a language other than English and speak a language other than English at home. In the Chinese, Portuguese, South Asian and West Indian groups a substantial majority of members (from 84% to 93%) were born outside of Canada and have been in Canada, on average, for a much shorter period of time than other groups (from 13 to 16 years). A substantial majority of the Chinese, Portuguese and South Asian group (around 90%) first spoke and still understand a language other than English and also speak a language other than English at home (from 65 to 77%). Slightly less than half of the Italian, S.C. European and S.E. European groups were born outside of Canada, but most (65% to 87%) speak English most often at home. The West Indian, South Asian and Dutch groups have significantly lower levels of income than the others, while the Jewish and the Scandinavian groups have significantly higher levels of income.

The Portuguese and Italian groups have lower levels of education than the others while the Jewish, South Asian and Others groups have higher levels. The Chinese group has both the largest proportion of members who have not completed grade school and the largest proportions who have taken some university courses or completed university.

A number of groups reside mainly in large cities in the Metro Toronto area or south central region of the province, these are: the Chinese, the Jewish, the Portuguese, the S.E. European, the South Asian, and the West Indian groups. Approximately 20% of the French groups are from Northern Ontario and 20% are from Western Ontario. A large proportion of the Dutch, German, S.C. European and Scandinavian groups reside in small cities, towns or rural areas.

## Leisure Participation

Leisure participation patterns were investigated in two ways. Respondents were asked about their participation in a wide array of leisure activities and were also asked what their favorite leisure activities were.

The groups' activity patterns can be categorized along two dimensions, the amount of variety in the activities in which the group participates and the level or frequency with which participants in the various activities actually participate. On the basis of these two dimensions, six activity pattern categories were developed.

Limited Variety-Low Activity. The Chinese and South Asian groups display profiles which show that they have (in most activities) smaller percentages of participants than do other groups. Those group members that do participate in activities also tend to do so with less frequency than others.

Limited Variety - Mixed Activity. In the Italian, Portuguese and West Indian groups, for most activities, there are relatively fewer participants than in other groups. The participants' activity rates in these groups display no clear trend but vary with the activities.

Wide Variety - High Activity. Only one group, the S.E. European, display a pattern of having relatively large numbers of members who participate in many activities who were also more active than others in these activities.

Wide Variety - Low Activity Only the Dutch group has relatively large numbers of members who participate in many activities but who participate at a lower level of frequency than participants in other groups.

Wide Variety -Mixed Levels In the French, Jewish, Scandinavian and Ukrainian group, for the majority of activities examined, there are a greater percentage of participants relative to all others. In these groups, the participants' rates of activity display no clear trend, but vary with activity.

Mixed Patterns. Groups which show no clear trend of either having either higher or lower percentages of participants in activities or of having either higher or lower levels of activity are: the British, Canadian, German, Other, Polish, and the S.C. European.

### Favorite Leisure Activities

Individuals were also asked about their three most favorite leisure activities. Reading for pleasure was reported by the greatest number of respondents to be a favorite activity while walking for pleasure was chosen second most frequently. Swimming, outdoor recreation (e.g., going to a park, beach activities and hiking) hobbies, (e.g., photography, woodworking, and cooking/baking) and social activities (e.g., time with children, going out and entertaining) follow in order of frequency.

There are significant variations in the types of favorite activities chosen by some of the ethnocultural groups. The Chinese, Italian, Portuguese, S.E. European and the West Indian group differed significantly from other groups in the favorite activities mentioned and the Ukrainian, Portuguese and S.E. European groups differed significantly from others in the second favorite activities mentioned. Some of the notable differences involved the Chinese and the Portuguese groups who reported that television was their favorite activity much more than did other groups. The Portuguese group also mentioned knitting/macrame while the West Indian group mentioned sewing as well as walking more often than did others. Spending time with the family was reported more often by the Italian group who along with the S.E. European group mentioned outdoor sports more often. The S.E. European group also mentioned exercise activities more often. The Ukrainian group more often reported hobbies.

### Favorite Activities - The Context of Participation

A number of questions were asked about people's favorite activities, such as where they participated in them and whether they were done with family, friends, or mostly alone. Those who did their favorite activities away from

the home were also asked if they preferred to do them at places where people had the same ethnic background as themselves. Those that did their favorite activity both away from the home and with friends they were also asked whether or not the ethnic background of the friends they participated with was similar to their own.

There are no significant differences among groups in terms of whether participation in their favorite and second favorite activity occurs at home or away from home. Sixty-three percent report doing their favorite activity away from home while 57% report doing their second favorite activity away from home.

There are also no significant differences among the groups in their reports about with whom they do their favorite activity. Thirty-five percent mentioned that they do them alone. Twenty-eight percent do them with friends and 20% with family members.

Of the respondents who did their favorite activities away from the home, those in the British, Canadian, S.C. European and S.E. European groups were significantly more likely to report participating in a favorite activity where people have the same ethnic background as they do. Respondents from the Chinese, Italian, Other, Portuguese, South Asian and West Indian Groups were significantly more likely to express preferences for participating where people have the same ethnic background as themselves.

#### Barriers to Participation.

Information was collected about both the extent to which people interviewed wanted to participate more often in both their favorite and second favorite leisure activities and about some of the things which might keep those that wished to participate more often from doing so. Of the respondents who identified an ethnocultural background other than Canadian and who participated in their favorite activity with friends, those who were members of the Chinese, Others and the South Asian groups were significantly more likely to report that participation in their favorite activities would



increase if they had more opportunities to do them with people of their own ethnocultural background. The Chinese, South Asian, West Indian, and German groups felt significantly more strongly than others that not having such opportunities prevented them from participating more often. Information about other barriers to increased participation was also gathered. The Chinese and Scandinavian group mentioned lack of time because of family more often than others, while the Portuguese group mentioned lack of time because of work. The West Indian group respondents mentioned fatigue or apathy and the need for a partner more often more often than others.

Respondents were also asked if there were any activities that they had never done but would like to do. Information was gathered about the first two activities mentioned. Most notable of these differences is the significantly relatively fewer numbers of Canadian group respondents mentioned activities that they have never participated in but would like to. Interestingly, the South Asian group offered significantly fewer second choices of activities that they have never participated in but would like to. The West Indian group feel significantly more strongly than others that they would like to participate in the activities that they mentioned. The S.C. Europeans differed significantly from others in the barriers they identified to increased participation in activities they had never done but wanted to do. They identified lack of time because of work and the need for someone to do it with and the fear of injury more often than others.

### Leisure Ethic

Two attitude scales were employed to assess the extent to which respondents held positive or negative feelings about leisure.

The Leisure Quality scale consists of items which deal with the amount of leisure people desire in life. Those that have high scores on this scale can be expected to desire more leisure in their lives than those with low scores. The West Indian, French, Italian, and Ukrainian have significantly higher scores, while the British, Dutch and S.C. European groups have significantly lower Leisure Quantity scores than others.

The Leisure Value scale consists of items which deal with the extent to which the experience of leisure is viewed in either a positive or negative manner. Those that have high scores on this scale can be expected to evaluate leisure experiences in a more positive fashion than those that have low scores. The British, Jewish, And Scandinavian groups have significantly higher scores than others while the Chinese, Italian, and South Asian groups have significantly lower scores than others.

### Leisure Motivations

Possible motivations for participating in one's favorite leisure activities were investigated. Although there are some significant differences, no discernible pattern among the groups responses is evident. People agreed most that they did their favorite leisure activities to relax. To get a change from the daily routines and to get exercise to keep in shape followed in the strength with which they were endorsed.

### Satisfaction With Areas of Life Related to Leisure

A number of questions were asked which probed the degree of satisfaction individuals had with specific areas of their lives related to their leisure. They can be broadly characterized as dealing with satisfaction with a person's total leisure, social leisure, outdoor and recreational facilities, entertainment media and amount of free time and income.

Social aspects of individuals' lives were given the highest satisfaction ratings. Respondents are most satisfied with the people that they spend time with outside of work. Second most satisfying are the things they do with their friends and the time they spend with their friends. Some of the areas with which people are relatively less satisfied are the entertainment they get, the amount of income they and their family have, the amount of time they have to do the things they want and the condition of the natural environment.

Distinct patterns are observed in the groups satisfaction profiles. The Chinese, Portuguese, South Asian, and West Indian groups are consistently less

satisfied. On the other hand, the British, Canadian, Italian and Scandinavian groups tend to be consistently more satisfied than others. The remainder of the groups' present no clear picture of either overall satisfaction or dissatisfaction.

#### The Need for Ethnocultural Specific Leisure Opportunities

Respondents who indicated that their ethnocultural group was other than Canadian were asked about the importance they attached to having a number of types of ethnoculturally specific leisure opportunities made more available to them. Six types of leisure activities were examined: music, dance or theatre; books, magazines or newspapers; social activities or events; movies television or radio programs; arts, crafts or hobbies; or sports, games, or outdoor activities. Members of each ethnocultural group were asked about these activities as they related specifically to their own ethnocultural backgrounds. For instance French respondents were asked how important it was for them to have French music, dance or theatre made more available to them.

The respondents, as a whole, do not attach a great deal of importance to having ethnocultural leisure activities made more available to them. The mean ratings for all leisure opportunities correspond to a rating of less than "somewhat important".

The Dutch, German, Italian, Polish, S.C. European and Scandinavian groups placed less importance than all others on having any of the leisure opportunities made more available. The British, Jewish, and the Ukrainian group had "mixed" profiles with no clear patterns.

The Portuguese, South Asian, West Indian and the Other groups placed significantly more importance than the rest of the group on having all the ethnoculturally specific leisure opportunities more available. The Chinese display a pattern of placing more importance than others on having all leisure opportunities available but are significantly higher in their ratings only for books, magazines or newspapers and television or radio.

The French group place significantly more importance than others only on having books/magazines and newspapers more available. The S.E. European group displayed a consistent pattern of attaching greater importance to all opportunities but books, magazines or newspapers, however, none of these differences were statistically significant.

## THE SURVEY OF MINISTRY OF TOURISM AND RECREATION CLIENT GROUPS

The second component of the study was a survey of recreation service providers who were clients of the Ministry's Recreation Division. This survey was designed to collect information about the extent to which these recreation service providers were responding to the needs of members of different ethnocultural backgrounds and determining the type of assistance they thought was required from the Ministry to enable them to be responsive. Of 300 questionnaires mailed out, 214 were completed and returned giving a response rate of 71%.

### Characteristics of Organizations Surveyed

Five types of organizations were surveyed: large city municipal recreation departments (the large city group) recreation departments from medium-sized cities (the medium city group), recreation departments from small cities, towns, rural areas or native bands (the town group), public service agencies (the public service group), provincial sports/recreation associations (the association group) and the Ministry of Tourism and Recreation staff (the Ministry group). Most of the respondents (63%) are from either medium-size or small-size municipal recreation departments.

### Ethnocultural Diversity of Client Base

Almost half the service providers from all groups but the medium city and town groups think there is either very great or great diversity in the ethnocultural backgrounds of their organizations's clients and 22% of the medium city group. Much fewer in the medium city or town group think so.



Most of the respondents mentioned English as the main ethnocultural backgrounds of their clients. About half mentioned French and/or Italian. More of the service providers in the large city group, the association group, and the Ministry group than the other groups, indicated that there was variety in the ethnocultural backgrounds of their clients.

The association group and the public service group were much less likely than others to report that their organizations provide assistance to other organizations. Of the respondents in organizations which provide assistance to other groups, most of the large city group and the Ministry group reported assisting ethnic or cultural client groups to provide their own recreation. The town group were least likely to report this type of assistance.

Few respondents from either the town group or the association group reported that their organizations had dealings with any formal ethnic or cultural associations. About half of respondents from the medium city, the public service group, and the Ministry group reported such dealings while all of the respondents from the large city group reported them.

#### Current Practices Regarding Ethnocultural Clients

A large majority of respondents in all groups but the large city group are not aware of any programs in their organization which has been specifically designed to serve people of a particular ethnic or cultural background (e.g., a recreation program for Italian seniors) nor has their organization had requests for changes to policies/procedures to accommodate the needs of a particular ethnic or cultural group. In all groups but the large city group, only a small minority indicated that their organization was either planning to make changes to some of its existing services or programs which would take into consideration the ethnic or cultural characteristics of some of its clients or planning new services.



### Importance of Providing Services to Members of Ethnocultural Groups

Respondents from the medium or town groups, the association group and the Ministry group think that their organization places low importance on providing services to members of ethnic or cultural groups other than British or French Canadians. Only the service providers from the large city group and the Ministry group are more likely than others to report that their organization was expending more effort over the past year on providing services for ethnocultural populations other than the British or French.

### Language of Services

Very few of the respondents except those from the large city group indicated that their organizations assisted ethnic or cultural groups to provide activities/programs in languages other than English or French. Very few respondents reported that languages other than English or French were used in their programs/activities. Of those who did mention other languages, the public service group respondents mentioned them most often, followed by large city group respondents.

Virtually none of the respondents from groups other than the large city group and the public service group indicated that their organizations produced promotional materials/advertisements in languages other than French or English. Most of the Ministry group indicated that their organization produced promotional materials/advertisements in French.

### Design and Delivery of Recreation Programs/Services

About half of the large city group and the public service group reported that their organization attempted to staff programs with individuals whose ethnic or cultural backgrounds were similar to those of the clients. Most respondents in the other groups indicated that their organization did not. However, the town group and associations group consider the ethnic or cultural backgrounds of their organizations' current full-time recreational staff to be

similar to the ethnic or cultural background of their organization's clients, while the majority of large city group and that of the Ministry group rated the similarity to be low or very low.

The town and association group consider similarity between the ethnic or cultural backgrounds of those who manage the respondents' organizations and the ethnic or cultural backgrounds of its present clients to be high. The large city group and the Ministry group gave the lowest ratings of similarity.

Among those respondents whose organization received direction from a community advisory/management board or planning committee, the majority in all groups but the large city group indicated that there was at least medium similarity.

#### Assistance for Recreation Organizations

Volunteer or service organizations such as service clubs, fraternal organizations, community associations, and church groups were most often identified as providing assistance to organization in their efforts to provide recreational services. These types of groups provide the bulk of assistance to large, medium and small cities, as well as to public service agencies. The Ministry of Tourism and Recreation is identified by 21% of the large city group, 16% of the associations group, and 10% of the town group, other groups make little mention of it.

Financial assistance or grants were reported as the types of assistance presently received from the Ministry of Tourism and Recreation. Assistance in the form of advice and consultation was mentioned second most often.

The majority of large city group and a substantial minority (around 42%) of the medium city and public service groups thought that the Ministry could be provide more assistance to their organization to help it design programs which are sensitive to the needs of individuals from different ethnic or cultural backgrounds. However, a large majority of the town group and the associations group thought that the Ministry could be of no assistance. Information and research were mentioned most often as the types of assistance people would like to receive.

About half of the large city group thought that the Ministry could be of assistance to their organization to help it staff programs in an ethnoculturally sensitive manner, while the majority of the respondents in the other groups thought it could not. Staffing grants and training were mentioned most often as the type assistance that could be provided.

The majority of the large city group and the public service group thought that the Ministry could provide more assistance to their organization to help it to deliver programs which were sensitive to the needs of individuals from different ethnic or cultural backgrounds. The majority of the other groups did not think the Ministry could assist them. Information and research were mentioned most often as the types of assistance that could be provided. Financial assistance and advice and consultation were mentioned second and third most often.

## Discussion

### Survey of Ethnocultural Populations

It is clear that people's leisure behaviour and attitudes vary according to their self-identified ethnocultural identities or backgrounds. In the survey of ethnocultural populations, a wide range of differences were evident among the 17 ethnocultural groups analyzed. Differences were found in leisure participation patterns, the social context of participation, perceptions as to

barriers to participation, leisure values, and motivations. Some groups participated in relatively fewer activities than others and of those that did participate, they did so less frequently. Most importantly, differences were observed in both the satisfaction that different ethnocultural groups had with areas of their life related to leisure and in their perceptions of needs for leisure opportunities. It can be concluded that ethnocultural groups vary in the extent to which they participate in the various components of recreation. This suggests that the recreation services provided could be improved.

The results of this study identify a number of groups which can be characterized as experiencing "leisure lack". Neulinger (1982) defines leisure lack as "the chronic or temporary absence of the experience of leisure, brought about through personal or societal conditions, and/or their interaction (pg.51). The Chinese, Portuguese, South Asian, and West Indian groups display a common pattern which distinguishes them from other groups. They participate in relatively fewer leisure activities than others do, and, for the most part, do so relatively less often than others. They express less satisfaction than do other groups with the leisure related areas of their lives and place less value on having leisure time available to them. For the most part, they attach more importance to having ethnocultural specific leisure opportunities made more available to them, suggesting that there is a perceived lack of such opportunities.

There are commonalities among these group in terms of some their sociodemographic characteristics. They are the four groups with the highest percentage of members who were born outside of Canada and their members have lived in Canada for the least amount of time (on average from 13 to 14 years). For all groups but the West Indians, a very high percentage of members first spoke and still understand a language other than English and speak a language other than English most often at home. Three of the four groups are visible minorities. Finally, in all groups, a large percentage of the members reside in large cities (55% to 85%). With the exception of the Portuguese group, the majority of members in these groups reside in the Metropolitan Toronto area (52% to 70%). It is possible then that their leisure lack is but one feature of an overall lack of acculturation and is related to their recency in Canada.



Despite the commonalities among these groups, there are important differences in the sociodemographic characteristics of each group which distinguish them from one another and bear consideration in any attempts to formulate strategies to ameliorate their leisure lack.

It is important to also point to the clear evidence that there are ethnocultural variations in the leisure life of many of the other groups studied. These variations do not appear in their leisure satisfaction or in their need for ethnoculturally specific leisure opportunities but are evident in differences in their activity patterns, their leisure values and their motivations. Recognition of the nature of these differences offers an opportunity for leisure service providers to tailor their services in a manner which is likely to maximize the satisfaction of the groups being serviced. Recreation providers would therefore benefit from profiles of the outstanding features of each group's leisure.

It should also be noted that statistical tests on small groups are less efficient at detecting differences. One consequence of this for the present research, is that because it is more difficult to detect differences uncovered among the smaller groups, the present research has been sensitive only to the grossest differences among groups. Given that these differences are evident throughout, one can expect an even greater number of differences to emerge in studies employing larger samples.

### Future Research

It would be useful for recreation service providers to be able to obtain "leisure profiles" for each ethnocultural population. Profiles could be developed from the data in this survey on the larger groups surveyed (e.g., the Canadian, French and British groups). For the smaller groups in this study, profiles could be developed by means of further surveys which focus on particular groups and obtain large numbers of respondents from which to develop precise estimates of key components of their leisure (i.e, activity profiles, motivations, etc.).



There is also a possibility that the ethnocultural groups are not homogeneous in either their leisure behaviour or their needs. Differences within groups may exist among those who differ in such things as age, gender, income and education. Further investigation of ethnocultural leisure on a group by group basis should investigate the existence of sub-groups within the population.

This research has not addressed the theoretical issue of whether ethnocultural variations in leisure are attributable to the values, traditions and customs of a particular group (the ethnicity explanation) or are due to variations among groups in terms of sociodemographic variables which relate to leisure such as income, age and gender (the sociodemographic perspective of leisure behaviour) or whether they are due to differences among groups in terms of their access to leisure institutions and activities (the marginality perspective). It is possible that groups such as the Chinese, Portuguese and South Asian, may have their access to leisure institutions limited because of language limitations. However, factors such as income and education may be operating as well. The ability of these theories to account for ethnocultural variations should be subjected to empirical variation by the application of statistical models which can assess the influence of ethnocultural identity upon leisure when the influence of such things as, length of residence in Canada, income, age and education have been controlled. Although the Ministry has committed itself to ensuring that it is responsive to the needs of ethnocultural populations in the province, it would nevertheless be important to be able to determine whether programs should be developed on the basis of ethnocultural identity of clients alone or whether other sociodemographic characteristics of the population should be considered.

#### The Survey of Recreation Service Providers

Concern for ethnocultural differences among clients is quite strong among the large city municipal recreation departments and very low among town or rural municipal recreation departments. Concern among medium size cities seems to be closer to that of town group. For these two groups, there is little perception that their client base is composed of clients with a diversity of ethnocultural backgrounds and client's ethnocultural backgrounds are thought

to be similar to those of the staff, management and advisory committees. As a consequence there is little concern with either inquiring about the ethnocultural backgrounds of its clients or considering their backgrounds when designing or running programs/services.

The large city group is by far the most sensitive to ethnocultural diversity of their clients. The public service group and the Ministry are overall the next most concerned about this. The provincial association group and medium city group are less concerned and the town group the least concerned.

It should be noted that of the four groups identified as having leisure lack all reside in large cities where the sensitivity to ethnocultural differences in leisure needs is the greatest.

The lack of uniformity among recreation service providers in their attitudes and practices towards providing ethnoculturally sensitive programs, suggests a need for ensuring that recreational leaders are educated about ethnocultural issues.

### Future Research

The survey of recreation service providers was quite small in scale and can present only a broad estimation of their policies and programs. Future research should attempt a more representative survey of organizations especially in the areas where ethnocultural diversity is the greatest in the Metropolitan Toronto area and south central Ontario.

### Conclusion

There are clear differences in leisure behaviour and attitudes of Ontario's various ethnocultural population. More importantly, there are a number of groups for whom recreational services could be improved. A number of the groups studies can be characterized as experiencing leisure lack (less participation and less satisfaction). All share common sociodemographic

characteristics, they are much more recent residents of Canada than other groups, they are all linguistically distinct from the majority of groups and/or are a visible minority. They also tend to have lower income and/or education than the majority of groups. One manifestation of these groups distinctiveness is that larger numbers in this group either prefer to participate where other people are similar to them in ethnocultural backgrounds, or would participate more in activities if they had more opportunities to participate with members of their own group. Whether or not their leisure lack is attributable mostly to their recency in Canada is a question in need of further research.

There are also other important variations in leisure behaviour and attitudes among ethnocultural groups which are not associated with leisure lack. Almost all groups differ in at least one of the many areas of their leisure assessed. Recognition of such differences and development of leisure profiles for each ethnocultural group should help recreation services to tailor their programs in a manner which will enhance there groups leisure lies.

Only tentative conclusions can be drawn about recreation service providers because of the small sample employed in their survey. Recreation service organizations seem to be aware of ethnocultural diversity in their client bases where such diversity is the greatest, the larger cities. Large city municipal recreation departments appear sensitive to the needs of ethnocultural programs as evidenced by their reports of programs designed for specific groups, the high proportion who report plans to modify services which take into consideration the ethnocultural backgrounds of clients and the fact that about half were planning to implement new programs which were sensitive to the ethnocultural backgrounds of their clients. There is, however, little offered in the way of services or promotional materials in languages other than English. As we have pointed out, three of the four groups experiencing leisure lack, speak languages other than English most often at home and are likely to have difficulty with programs and materials conducted in English.

In summary, there are evident differences in leisure among individuals of different ethnocultural backgrounds. Some groups can be characterized as

suffering leisure lack. Leisure service providers seem to be responsive to the ethnocultural backgrounds of clients but mainly in the larger cities. However, the groups characterized as having leisure lack tend to reside primarily in large cities, so such responsiveness may not be having the impact desired. Future research would best be directed at establishing leisure profiles for different ethnocultural groups and at providing a more complete understanding of efforts being made to provide ethnocultural responsive services, particularly in those areas where ethnocultural diversity is greatest. For residents of Ontario who do not reside in larger cities, ethnoculturally responsive services may be difficult to obtain.







3 1761 11546428 1

